UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/683,794	02/15/2002	Takenori Kohda	JP920000363US1	2202

877   7590   05/01/2007
IBM CORPORATION, T.J. WATSON RESEARCH CENTER
P.O. BOX 218
YORKTOWN HEIGHTS, NY 10598

EXAMINER
BASEHOAR, ADAM L

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2178	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
05/01/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	09/683,794	KOHDA ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Adam L. Basehoar	2178	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>05 February 2007</u>.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-24, 28-33 and 35* is/are pending in the application.

  4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-24, 28-33 and 35* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

  Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

  Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

  a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

    1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

    2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

    3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

  * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3)☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>01/16/07</u>.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6)☐ Other: _____ .

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This action is responsive to communications: The Amendment filed 02/05/07.

2.   Claim 34 has been cancelled as necessitated by Amendment.

3.   Claims 1-24, 28-33, and 35 are pending in the case. Claims 1, 6, 9, 12, 15, 19, 21-23, and

28-30 are independent claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in
> section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are
> such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person
> having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the
> manner in which the invention was made.

5.   Claims 1-5, 9-14, 19-20, 23-24, 28, and 30-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as

being unpatentable over Vu et al (US-2002/0078091 06/20/02) in view of Martins (US-6,608,615

08/19/03) in further view of Nakao (US-6,205,456 03/20/01).

       -In regard to independent claim 1, Vu et al teach determining the layout of a digital

document (Page 4: Paragraph 0069: "the summarizer 14 parses the target document 16 into a

hierarchical document tree") based on digital document display from historical data for said

document, acquired previously (Page 2: Paragraphs 0020-0032)(Fig. 2: 18, 19, 20, and 22);

       generating data relating to the display form of said digital document (Page 4: Paragraphs

69-70: "The total weights generated...by the summary generator 14"), said data including a

summary preparation request designating a sentence in the digital document for which

summarization was required (Paragraph 2: "features of the document

include....sentences...words"; Paragraph 71: "assigns a weight to each node"; Paragraph 74:

"user supplied percentage of the target document");

and a summarization engine for generating a summary in response to said data (Fig 2: 14

& 17: "Summary Generator" & "Summary Selector")

a user interface for displaying said digital document based on said data relating to said

display form (Page 5: Paragraph 0075: "Finally, the summary.....in a linear order")(Fig. 1: 21).

Vu et al do not specifically teach wherein said generated data included a summary

summarization keyword and a summarization rate indicative of a ratio of length of a summary to

length of an original sentence in the digital document. Nakao teaches wherein a summarization

request included a summarization keyword (column 37, lines 36-43: "extracting a sentence

containing a keyword...using a keyword") and a summarization ratio (column 29, lines 33-44:

"ratio of the length of the summary to the original sentence are provided as parameters"). It

would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention for the

summarization generator of Vu et al to have generated data including a summarization keyword

and summarization rate, because Nakao teaches that displaying a summarization keyword in the

summary provided less confusion to the user by showing that the portion was relevant to the

user's request (column 5, lines 3-31) and that the summarization ratio provided the benefit of

being able to automatically change the length of the summary depending on the importance the

document (column 29, lines 33-44).

Vu et al do not specifically teach wherein the historical data utilized was historical data

of use of said document acquired by said browsing system. Martins teaches the utilization of

historical data of a use of a document (column 2, lines 27-50) acquired previously by said

browser system (column 4, lines 13-25)(Figs. 1 & 2). It would have been obvious to one of

ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention for the browsing system of Vu et al to have

acquired historical data based on the previously viewed document, because Martins teaches by

doing so a browsing system can then provide a method for more efficiently viewing the

previously viewed documents (column 2, lines 28-50: "more efficiently viewing web pages").

     -In regard to dependent claim 2, Vu et al teach wherein said layout engine (Page 3:

Paragraph 0038) uses said historical data (Page 2: Paragraphs 0019-0020)(Fig. 2: 19) when

allocating a display area for each area constituting said document (Pages 4 & 5: Paragraphs

0074-0075).

     -In regard to dependent claims 3 and 11, Vu et al teach a history database (Page 2:

Paragraphs 0019-0020)(Fig. 2: 19), wherein after said document has been displayed via the

interface (Page 5: Paragraph 0075: "Finally, the summary.....in a linear order")(Fig. 1: 21), by

using a predetermined display form for a predetermined period of time (Page 4: Paragraph 0074:

i.e. while the user-supplied percentage remains unchanged), updating said display form by said

user (i.e. changing the user-supplied the percentage to determine a new weighting threshold).

     As discussed above, Vu et al does not specifically teach wherein the history database was

within said browsing system. Martins teaches the utilization of historical data of a use of a

document (column 2, lines 27-50) acquired previously by said browser system (column 4, lines

13-25)(Figs. 1 & 2) to provide a method for more efficiently viewing the previously viewed

documents (column 2, lines 28-50: "more efficiently viewing web pages").

Vu et al also do not specifically teach storing the display form as historical data in said

history database; and wherein said layout engine determines said layout of said document based

on said historical data from said database. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in

the art at the time of the invention for Vu et al to have store the historical data of the previous

display of the document in the history database, because Vu et al teach collecting contextual data

external to the document (Pages 1 & 2: Paragraphs 0009 & 0021-0030) as training documents to

provide the benefit of identifying features of the target document that are likely to be important

(Page 2: Paragraph 0020). In addition, Martins teaches storing the display form as historical data

in said history database and determining said layout of the document based on said historical

data (column 2, lines 27-50; column 4, lines 13-25).

-In regard to dependent claim 4, Vu et al teach preparing summaries for sentences (Page

4: Paragraph 0069: "section layer 32, paragraph layer 34, a phrase layer 36") in said digital

document based on said historical data (Page 2: Paragraphs 0019-0020)(Fig. 2: 19);

wherein said summaries are arranged in accordance with said layout determined by said

layout engine (Page 3: Paragraph 0038: "On the basis...for the target document"), and generates

data for display (Page 5: Paragraph 0075: "Finally, the summary.....in a linear order").

-In regard to dependent claim 5, Vu et al teach based on said historical data (Page 2:

Paragraphs 0019-0020)(Fig. 2: 19) determining which parameters are required for summarization

(Page 4: Paragraph 0069), and preparing a summary for each of the predetermined sentence

elements that constitute the sentences of said digital document (Page 4: Paragraph 0074)(Fig. 4).

-In regard to independent claims 9, 19, 23, 30 and dependent claims 10, 20, and 24, Vu et

al teach a process for obtaining a target sentence to be summarized (Page 4: Paragraph 0069:

"section layer 32, paragraph layer 34, a phrase layer 36");

generating data relating to the display form of said digital document (Page 4: Paragraphs

69-70: "The total weights generated...by the summary generator 14"), said data including a

summary preparation request designating a sentence in the digital document for which

summarization was required (Paragraph 2: "features of the document

include....sentences...words"; Paragraph 71: "assigns a weight to each node"; Paragraph 74:

"user supplied percentage of the target document");

a process for obtaining historical data related to a summary for said target sentence from

a summarization history database (Page 2: Paragraphs 0020-0030)(Fig. 2: 18, 19, 20, and 22) in

which historical data are stored related to a previous summarization of a predetermined sentence

(Page 3: Paragraph 0038: "The context miner....from the training data"); and

determining which parameters are required for the preparation of said summary based on

said historical data (Page 4: Paragraph 0069), and preparing said summary of said target sentence

based on said parameters (Page 4: Paragraph 0074).

Vu et al do not specifically teach wherein said generated data included a summary

summarization keyword and a summarization rate indicative of a ratio of length of a summary to

length of an original sentence in the digital document. Nakao teaches wherein a summarization

request included a summarization keyword (column 37, lines 36-43: "extracting a sentence

containing a keyword...using a keyword") and a summarization ratio (column 29, lines 33-44:

"ratio of the length of the summary to the original sentence are provided as parameters"). It

would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention for the

summarization generator of Vu et al to have generated data including a summarization keyword

and summarization rate, because Nakao teaches that displaying a summarization keyword in the

summary provided less confusion to the user by showing that the portion was relevant to the

user's request (column 5, lines 3-31) and that the summarization ratio provided the benefit of

being able to automatically change the length of the summary depending on the importance the

document (column 29, lines 33-44).

Vu et al do not specifically teach wherein the historical data utilized was historical data

of use of said document acquired by said browsing system. Martins teaches the utilization of

historical data of a use of a document (column 2, lines 27-50) acquired previously by said

browser system (column 4, lines 13-25)(Figs. 1 & 2). It would have been obvious to one of

ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention for the browsing system of Vu et al to have

acquired historical data based on the previously viewed document, because Martins teaches by

doing so a browsing system can then provide a method for more efficiently viewing the

previously viewed documents (column 2, lines 28-50: "more efficiently viewing web pages").

-In regard to independent claim 12, Vu et al teach an input function for entering a digital

document to be displayed (Page 4: Paragraph 0069: "the summarizer 14 parses the target

document 16 into a hierarchical document tree"); and

a display function for displaying the digital document using a predetermined display form (Page 3: Paragraph 0038) and displays a summary that was prepared based on historical data related to a display form previously used (Pages 2 & 4: Paragraphs 0020-0030 & 0069-0071: i.e. based on the training data derived from the historical data) and other data including a summary preparation request designating a sentence in the digital document for which summarization was required (Paragraph 2: "features of the document include….sentences…words"; Paragraph 71: "assigns a weight to each node"; Paragraph 74: "user supplied percentage of the target document").

Vu et al do not specifically teach wherein said generated data included a summary summarization keyword and a summarization rate indicative of a ratio of length of a summary to length of an original sentence in the digital document. Nakao teaches wherein a summarization request included a summarization keyword (column 37, lines 36-43: "extracting a sentence containing a keyword…using a keyword") and a summarization ratio (column 29, lines 33-44: "ratio of the length of the summary to the original sentence are provided as parameters"). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention for the summarization generator of Vu et al to have generated data including a summarization keyword and summarization rate, because Nakao teaches that displaying a summarization keyword in the summary provided less confusion to the user by showing that the portion was relevant to the user's request (column 5, lines 3-31) and that the summarization ratio provided the benefit of being able to automatically change the length of the summary depending on the importance the document (column 29, lines 33-44).

Vu et al do not specifically teach wherein the historical data utilized was historical data

of use of said document acquired by said browsing system. Martins teaches the utilization of

historical data of a use of a document (column 2, lines 27-50) acquired previously by said

browser system (column 4, lines 13-25)(Figs. 1 & 2). It would have been obvious to one of

ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention for the browsing system of Vu et al to have

acquired historical data based on the previously viewed document, because Martins teaches by

doing so a browsing system can then provide a method for more efficiently viewing the

previously viewed documents (column 2, lines 28-50: "more efficiently viewing web pages").

-In regard to dependent claim 13, Vu et al teach determining which parameters are

required for the preparation of said summary based on said historical data (Page 4: Paragraphs

0069-0071), and preparing said summary of said target sentence based on said parameters (Page

4: Paragraph 0074).

-In regard to dependent claim 14, Vu et al teach based on said historical data (Page 4:

Paragraph 0069-0071), said display function (Page 5: Paragraph 0075: "summary selector

displays...a linear order")(Fig. 1: 21) displays said summary in areas arranged for the individual

elements that constitute said document (Page 4: Paragraphs 0074-0075).

-In regard to independent claim 28, Vu et al teach a process for extracting the structure of

a digital document (Page 4: Paragraph 0069: "the summarizer 14 parses the target document 16

into a hierarchical document tree");

a process for replacing the original contents of each element of the structure with a

summary (Page 4: Paragraph 0074: "marks each feature with a display flag") prepared based on

historical data (Page 3: Paragraph 0038: i.e. based on training documents & Page 2: Paragraphs

0020-0030) related to a display form previously used for displaying said digital document (Page

3: Paragraph 3: "The feature vectors of.....of the target document 16."), and generating data

related to the new form (Page 4: Paragraph 0070: "The total weights generated...by the summary

generator 14.") and other data including a summary preparation request designating a sentence in

the digital document for which summarization was required (Paragraph 2: "features of the

document include....sentences...words"; Paragraph 71: "assigns a weight to each node";

Paragraph 74: "user supplied percentage of the target document"); and

a process for displaying said new display form on a display device (Page 5: Paragraph

0075: "Finally, the summary.....in a linear order").

Vu et al do not specifically teach wherein said generated data included a summary

summarization keyword and a summarization rate indicative of a ratio of length of a summary to

length of an original sentence in the digital document. Nakao teaches wherein a summarization

request included a summarization keyword (column 37, lines 36-43: "extracting a sentence

containing a keyword...using a keyword") and a summarization ratio (column 29, lines 33-44:

"ratio of the length of the summary to the original sentence are provided as parameters"). It

would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention for the

summarization generator of Vu et al to have generated data including a summarization keyword

and summarization rate, because Nakao teaches that displaying a summarization keyword in the

summary provided less confusion to the user by showing that the portion was relevant to the

user's request (column 5, lines 3-31) and that the summarization ratio provided the benefit of

being able to automatically change the length of the summary depending on the importance the

document (column 29, lines 33-44).

Vu et al do not specifically teach that all the elements of the digital document are always

displayed simultaneously on a single screen. Martins teaches simultaneously displaying all the

elements of the digital document on a single display screen (column 2, lines 28-50; column 5,

lines 48-65)(Fig. 5). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of

the invention for the browsing system of Vu et al to have always displayed all the elements of the

document on a single screen, because Martins teaches by doing so a browsing system can then

provide a method for more efficiently viewing the previously viewed documents (column 2, lines

28-50: "more efficiently viewing web pages"; column 5, lines 48-65: "increasing the user's

browsing efficiency and mitigating information overload").

-In regard to dependent claims 31-33, Vu et al teach an interface were the user-supplied

percentage resulted in creating a view for the document (Page 4: Paragraph 0074). Vu et al does

not specifically teach wherein the user can update the user-supplied percentage to create a new

view. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention,

that if the user of Vu et al had changed the user-supplied percentage, a new weight threshold

would have been generated and a new view based on said threshold would have been displayed.

Said change providing the obvious benefit of further user preferred document customization.

Martins also teaches wherein view update request could be made for a new view of document

based on a user request to view a document and how a user had previously used or viewed said

document (column 2, lines 28-50).

6.   Claims 6-8, 15-18, 21-22, 29, and 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Vu et al (US-2002/0078091 06/20/02) in view of Martins (US-6,608,615

08/19/03).

        -In regard to independent claims 6, 22, and 29, Vu et al teach generating a display form

(Fig. 1: 21) wherein display areas to be allocated to elements (Page 4: Paragraph 0069: "section

layer 32, paragraph layer 34, a phrase layer 36")(Fig. 4) constituting said document are altered in

accordance with importance levels of said elements (Page 4: Paragraphs 0070-0075), while the

structure of a digital document was maintained (Page 5: Paragraph 0075: "Finally, the

summary.....in a linear order"); and

        displaying said digital document in said generated display form (Page 5: Paragraph 0075:

"Finally, the summary.....in a linear order").

        Vu et al do not specifically teach that all the elements of the digital document are always

displayed simultaneously on a single screen. Martins teaches simultaneously displaying all the

elements of the digital document on a single display screen (column 2, lines 28-50; column 5,

lines 48-65)(Fig. 5). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of

the invention for the browsing system of Vu et al to have always displayed all the elements of the

document on a single screen, because Martins teaches by doing so a browsing system can then

provide a method for more efficiently viewing the previously viewed documents (column 2, lines

28-50: "more efficiently viewing web pages"; column 5, lines 48-65: "increasing the user's

browsing efficiency and mitigating information overload).

-In regard to dependent claim 7, Vu et al teach determining the importance of elements in

a document and allocating a small display area (i.e. ignore the feature) for an element having a

low importance (Page 4: Paragraph 0074: i.e. feature weight lower than weight threshold) and a

large area (i.e. flag the feature for inclusion) for an element having a high importance (Page 4:

Paragraph 0074: i.e. feature weight higher than weight threshold).

Vu et al does not teach wherein if all the elements of the document were displayed,

allocating a small display area for elements of low importance and a large area for an element

having high importance. Martins teaches always displaying all the elements of the digital

document on a single display screen (column 2, lines 28-50; column 5, lines 48-65)(Fig. 5). It

would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention for the

browsing system of Vu et al to have always displayed all the elements of the document on a

single screen, because Martins teaches by doing so a browsing system can then provide a method

for more efficiently viewing the previously viewed documents (column 2, lines 28-50: "more

efficiently viewing web pages").

-In regard to dependent claim 8, Vu et al teach maintaining the linear order of the target

document (Fig. 4) in the new display form (Page 5: Paragraph 0075: "Finally, the summary.....in

a linear order"). Vu et al also teach based on the values of the feature weights (Page 4:

Paragraph 0074), arranging a display area near the center of said display form for an element

having high importance level (i.e. higher feature weight marked for inclusion in the completed

summary) (Page 4: Paragraph 0074). Vu et al do not teach arranging a display area nearer the

side for said display form for an element of low importance (i.e. lower feature weight marked for

exclusion from the completed summary). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in

the art at the time of the invention for Vu et al to have moved features with feature weights less

than the weight threshold (Page 4: Paragraph 0074), because Vu et al teach wherein features of

low importance "can be safely ignored" (Page 1: Paragraph 0006) and thus putting said features

near the side would have been obvious to put lesser emphasis on the features by placing them in

the periphery of a users view. Martins also teaches modifying regions of a web page so that

certain regions or high importance are emphasized over certain regions of low importance.

Martins teaches that doing provides a method for more efficiently viewing the previously viewed

documents (column 2, lines 28-50: "more efficiently viewing web pages").

        -In regard to independent claim 15, Vu et al teach a display function (Page 4: Paragraphs

0074-0075) for displaying the digital document using a predetermined display form (Page 3:

Paragraph 0038); and

        a display update function (Page 4, Paragraph 0074: "user-supplied percentage"),

maintaining the structure of said digital document (Page 5: Paragraph 0075: "Finally, the

summary.....in a linear order"), alters the display areas to be allocated for elements in said digital

document (Page 4, Paragraph 0074: "determines a weight threshold"), and displays said digital

document (Fig. 1: 21).

Vu et al do not specifically teach that all the elements of the digital document are always displayed simultaneously on a single screen. Martins teaches simultaneously displaying all the elements of the digital document on a single display screen (column 2, lines 28-50; column 5, lines 48-65)(Fig. 5). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention for the browsing system of Vu et al to have always displayed all the elements of the document on a single screen, because Martins teaches by doing so a browsing system can then provide a method for more efficiently viewing the previously viewed documents (column 2, lines 28-50: "more efficiently viewing web pages"; column 5, lines 48-65: "increasing the user's browsing efficiency and mitigating information overload").

-In regard to dependent claim 16, Vu et al teach wherein said display function displays an image (Page 5: Paragraph 0075: "Finally, the summary.....in a linear order") using a size that corresponds to the display area of a sentence portion in said digital document that was relevant to said image (Page 4: Paragraph 0074: i.e. displays a sentence portion when said sentence was relevant enough to have a feature weight above the weight threshold).

-In regard to dependent claim 17, Vu et al teach initially said display function enlarges a display area for an element located at the head of said digital document (Page 1: Paragraph 0007: "assign greater weight....beginning of the news-story") and reduces the display areas for succeeding elements (Page 1: Paragraph 0006: "and what features can be safely ignored"); and reducing a summarization rate for an element located at the head of said digital document (Page 4: Paragraph 0074: i.e. weight threshold decreased for head elements (Fig. 4: 32)) and increases

said summarization rate for succeeding elements (Page 4: Paragraph 0074: weight threshold

increased for non-head elements (Fig. 4: 38) and when successively using the update function

(Page 4: Paragraph 0074: "user-supplied percentage") shifts rearward the range wherein a large

display area was set (i.e. feature weight of feature greater than weight threshold) and said

summarization rate was reduced for the sentence element (Page 4: Paragraph 0074: feature

weight threshold reduced).

-In regard to dependent claim 18, Vu et al teach accepting an update request for a

predetermined designated portion already being displayed (Page 4: Paragraph 0074: i.e. user-

selectable percentage was changed), and enlarging a display area for an element in said

designated portion (i.e. if the weight threshold was reduced and the element previously below the

threshold was now above it then the display area would be enlarged), and displays a sentence in

said designated portion (Page 4: Paragraph 0069: "section layer 32, paragraph layer 34, a phrase

layer 36")(Fig. 4), instead of a sentence having a low summarization rate (i.e. below the weight

threshold and not viewable).

-In regard to independent claims 21 and 29, Vu et al teach a process for extracting the

structure of a digital document (Page 4: Paragraph 0069: "the summarizer 14 parses the target

document 16 into a hierarchical document tree");

a process for replacing the original contents of each element of the structure with a

summary (Page 4: Paragraph 0074: "marks each feature with a display flag") prepared based on

historical data (Page 3: Paragraph 0038: i.e. based on training documents & Page 2: Paragraphs

0020-0030) related to a display form previously used for displaying said digital document (Page

3: Paragraph 3: "The feature vectors of.....of the target document 16."), and generating data

related to the new form (Page 4: Paragraph 0070: "The total weights generated...by the summary

generator 14."); and

a process for displaying said new display form on a display device (Page 5: Paragraph

0075: "Finally, the summary.....in a linear order").

Vu et al do not specifically teach that all the elements of the digital document are always

displayed simultaneously on a single screen. Martins teaches simultaneously displaying all the

elements of the digital document on a single display screen (column 2, lines 28-50; column 5,

lines 48-65)(Fig. 5). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of

the invention for the browsing system of Vu et al to have always displayed all the elements of the

document on a single screen, because Martins teaches by doing so a browsing system can then

provide a method for more efficiently viewing the previously viewed documents (column 2, lines

28-50: "more efficiently viewing web pages"; column 5, lines 48-65: "increasing the user's

browsing efficiency and mitigating information overload").

-In regard to dependent claim 35, Vu et al teach assigning importance levels to document

features based on a user defined percentage (Page 4: Paragraphs 0072-0074). Vu et al also teach

wherein the importance levels of document features were based on the popularity of the target

document (i.e. number of times accessed)(Page 2: Paragraph 0024) and web server logs

concerning the documents activity (Page 2: Paragraph 0033). Vu et al do not specifically teach

increasing the importance levels of the document features as time increases since last displayed.

Martins teaches increasing importance levels of viewable elements of a document as time increases since the document was last displayed (column 2, lines 28-50) so that during each subsequent request of said document more important information can be emphasized while less important information can be reduced. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention for the browsing system of Vu et al to have increased the importance levels of the document features as time increases since last displayed, because Martins teaches by doing so a browsing system can then provide a method for more efficiently viewing the previously viewed documents (column 2, lines 28-50: "more efficiently viewing web pages").

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1 and 4 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

-In regard to dependent claim 2, Applicant argues that Vu et al teaches away from the display area for each element feature of the claim. The Examiner notes that unlike claim 6, all the elements of the digital document are not always simultaneously displayed. Vu et al clearly teaches wherein each document parts is allocated a display area based on the their importance level and the defined threshold. Thus when a display element was not displayed based on the level of importance, that element was given zero display area.

-In regard to dependent claim 3, the Examiner respectfully disagrees and believes as detailed above in the rejection, that the Martins reference teaches that the historical database was within said browsing system.

-In regard to independent claim 6, Applicant argues that neither Martins nor Vu et al teach that all elements are simultaneously displayed. The Examiner respectfully disagrees and notes that Martins clearly teaches wherein the display areas of less important information could be changed (column 2, lines 36-50: e.g. grayed out, different color, brightness, etc) and not necessarily removed from the document.

-In regard to dependent claim 7, the Applicant argues that neither of the references teach displaying a small display area for an element of low importance and a large display area for an element of high importance. The Examiner respectfully disagrees. Vu et al clearly teaches changing the size of a lower importance element by eliminating that element from the document summary. Martins also clearly teaches the benefits of representing data of different importance levels on a document in a changed form. While the examples of Martins do not specifically recite changing the size of the elements, it would have been obvious to one or ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention in view of Vu et al for those changes to having included size changes (column 2, lines 39-40: "other changes are also within the scope of the invention").

-In regard to dependent claim 8, the Examiner respectfully disagrees with the Applicant again. The teachings of Vu et al in further view of Martins reference teaches modifying content so that less important information was unobtrusive to the user by either removing the data off the document or changing the data in a well known manner (column 2, lines 39-40: "other changes are also within the scope of the invention"). It thus would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include repositioning the elements so that those elements would in fact be less obtrusive to the user.

-In regard to dependent claim 35, Applicant argues that neither Vu et al nor Martins teach

wherein the importance levels increase as time increases. The Examiner respectfully disagrees

and notes that while Martins teaches slowly deemphasizing previously viewed content over a

plurality of visits, Martins also clearly teaches wherein the importance levels of the information

not viewed on those previous visits was increased over time in proportion to the decrease in the

viewed content (column 4, lines 65-67; column 5, lines 1-17). As claimed the importance levels

for all document content do not have to increase with time.

Conclusion

8.   Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this

Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a).

Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO

MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after

the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period

will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37

CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this

final action.

9.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Adam L. Basehoar whose telephone number is (571)-272-4121.

The examiner can normally be reached on M-F: 7:00am - 4:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Steve Hong can be reached on (571) 272-4124. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

ALB

STEPHEN HONG
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER